

Altman, Rebecca

Subject: FW: Land east of Knowle Lane - ref. F/23/94668

From: Dyer, Tim <Tim.Dyer@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 May 2023 12:42
To: Altman, Rebecca <rebecca.altman@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Land east of Knowle Lane - ref. F/23/94668

Hi Rebecca,

Following our discussion this morning I am minded to remove my holding objection. Although I can foresee that various aspects of the landscape proposals may not be deliverable, due to the reasons set out below, I am confident that solutions are possible and could be delivered through a suitable landscape condition.

Following and subject to a successful planning permission it would be useful to discuss the landscape proposals with the applicants Landscape Architects to determine the best way forward for the discharge of condition. Thanks, Tim

Tim Dyer

Urban and Landscape Design Team Leader

Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Housing and Development

Ext.: 8132

From: Dyer, Tim
Sent: 30 May 2023 01:06
To: Altman, Rebecca <rebecca.altman@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Land east of Knowle Lane - ref. F/23/94668

Hi Rebecca,

Thank you for the additional information which I have reviewed (in blue) next to my previous comments in black. I hope my update is useful but please give me a ring if it would be helpful to discuss things further? Thanks, Tim

- The proposed development appears to project into the countryside beyond the existing urban edge.
- SuDS. A system seems to be already under construction. The application lacks sufficient details of the proposed system. It will need to see all four pillars of the SUDS Design (water quantity, water quality, amenity and biodiversity). Does it connect to any existing watercourses? [The Drainage Overlay Plan identifies a thin blue line and cross hatch, which I assume is surface water and rainwater from roofs. Red is presumably foul.](#)
[I still cannot see a system that integrates into the proposals and covers the CIRIA four pillars. The focus seems to be on water volume. Although this has help establish conflicts.](#)
- The existing trees have been very poorly treated with construction works and clearance doing lots damage. This was still happening when the LVIA photos were taken.
- Restoration and final use of landfill site? Is this to be agricultural land, open space or some other use? The final use affects the potential impact of the development particularly if it will have public access. [The final use of this land is important because the proximity of the buildings on the southern boundary of the site and the nearby services \(and presumably its easement\), severely restrict the scale for mitigation planting.](#)
- The Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal should be used in an iterative design process to improve the proposals. [Not conforming to best practice](#)

- The LVIA viewpoints should be winter views to understand the worst case. [Not conforming to best practice](#)
- Mortimers Lane. I am unclear if the proposed buildings, particularly the roofline, will be visible from Mortimers Lane. The LVIA implies it is hidden by landform but the vegetation that remains seems to be visible. Sections or verifiable visualisations could resolve this and the development parameters. [No change](#)
- Views from Carnival Gardens will show development projecting into the countryside.
- The Southern Water easement seems to conflict with the tree planting shown on the plan. Can the easement be added to show that trees are deliverable? [The Drainage Overlay Plan and Landscape Layout Plan seem to show the alignment of services but not their required easements. The proposals do not show how the mature tree canopy will interact with these services or be affected by them. As discussed below some trees have been removed but I can see more will need to be removed to accommodate easements particularly the overhead power, foul sewer and pumping station.](#)
- Potential conflicts with lighting layout arising to retention or management issues? Lighting should be shown on the landscape plans. [Still not shown on the landscape plan but four trees have subsequently been removed from the northern parking area which would reduce the conflict.](#)
- Many of the proposed trees seem very close to, or on top of the drainage system indicating that they may not be achievable. These need to be crosschecked prior to any approval? Drainage and other services need to be on the landscape proposals. [Trees are proposed on top of the storage crates. Details will be need but can be conditioned](#)
- Proposal should seek to improve the existing oak trees and establish new trees along the northern boundary. How will this work with the existing underground HV cables? [No change](#)
- The southern boundary looks poor with the overhead cables severely limiting opportunities to screen or soften the poor elevation. The building is too tight to the boundary offering no significant tree planting. [No change](#)
- The landscape proposals are vague and unsubstantial. It does not reassure me that the proposals are suitable or deliverable. [The sketch proposals are insubstantial, in terms of information as has been highlighted in the conflict identified above.](#)

In conclusion

Development has already been permitted on part of this site, in the area nearest to the built edge. The spreading out of the development over a larger area of the site has constrained the potential space to mitigate its effect. Existing and proposed services add an addition constraint to the remaining space. Where mitigation is proposed I am unconvinced that it has been considered in enough detail to be deliverable and my concern is that it cannot simply be conditioned. More information is required and currently I recommend a holding objection until the areas above can be addressed.